

Archetypal Gender Ontology

Kent D. Palmer, Ph.D.

714-633-9508

kent@palmer.name

<http://kdp.me>

Orange CA 92867

Copyright 1998, 2014 K.D. Palmer.
All Rights Reserved. Not for distribution.
Version 0.00; 06/16/98; ago00v00.doc
Edited: 2014.02.18

Introduction:

In this essay we will explore the meaning of gender and the archetypal relations that exist between the genders in Indo-European cultures. This is necessary in order to allow us to recognize who we are as people in a world that is full of illusion concerning gender related issues. One of the thrusts of this paper is to identify one of the most ubiquitous types of cultural blindness that occurs in the World Dominant Western Culture. This cultural blindspot plays no small role in determining how we see ourselves and each other.

We take as our starting point the deepest consideration that has been made to date concerning the meaning of Gender. This is in the book *Gender Thinking*¹ by Steven G. Smith. In that book Mr. Smith proposes that we look at gender in terms of "kinds of a kind". This means that human kindness is a certain kind of thing and that each gender is a sub-kind of this higher kind. This implies that men and women have different essences that are part of the human essence yet different from each other. We will take issue with this definition and attempt to push it deeper in order to find out the real nature of Gender within the Western Tradition.

Our point of departure is to recognize a

¹ (Temple University, Philadelphia PA 1992)
ISBN 0-87722-964-3 LC 91-47720

phenomena that is pervasive but hidden in our time which as been called here "the fragmentation of Being." This phenomena is seen best in the discovery by various continental philosophers of different sorts of Being in this century. In previous studies these different sorts of Being have been identified and their relations between each other have been examined. We will repeat this analysis here as an ontological basis for the consideration of gender. We follow Heidegger in first distinguishing *Being* from *beings*. This is called Ontological Difference. If one accepts that there is a difference between individual beings and a certain property that they all share that makes them *beings* then the stage is set for the consideration of the nature of Being *qua* Being itself. This study is called ontology. Up until this century Being was pretty boring because it was unified and utterly undifferentiated conceptually. However, with the invention of phenomenology by Husserl and the aggressive exploration of human experience, as it is, as the basis for philosophizing, there were several discoveries that immediately led to the differentiation of Being. The main discovery was that in our experience essences and simple ideas are not the same. Simple ideas are abstractions while essences are the constraints governing the attributes of things. Once they were recognized to be different then the stage was set to recognize two kinds of being-in-the-world which were called Pure Being and Process Being. The realm of Pure Being is the realm of abstract glosses produced by ideation that posits illusory continuity as its basis. The realm of Process Being mixes Being with time and sees the flux of experience and the unfolding of things in which the essence changes over time. Once these two modalities of being-in-the-world were posited then the hunt was on for further types of modalities. In fact eventually two further types of modality were discovered. One is called Hyper Being and it relates to the discontinuities in the unfolding process that produces different essences. Another is Wild Being that is the mixture of Continuity and Discontinuity, or Order and Disorder. My own contribution to this process of discovery was to realize that the different kinds of Being found by the various continental philosophers formed a hierarchy of meta-levels in which each one was an emergent unfolding at a higher meta-level. Also over time it became clear that there is no fourth meta-level of Being, or rather perhaps it was just very difficult to think about, so no one has come up

Archetypal Gender Ontology -- KENT PALMER

with a description of it as yet.

Pure	Process	Hyper	Wild
Subject/ object	Dasein/ non- dasein	Query/ non-query	Enigma/ non-enigma
Present-at- hand	Ready-to- hand	In-hand	Out-of-hand
point	grasp	bear	encompass
determinate	probabilit y	possibility	Propensity, tendency
continuity	modality	kind	integra
Being ¹	Being ²	Being ³	Being ⁴
appearance	essence	meta- essence	berserker, line of flight

Thus Being that was a continuity previously in Western intellectual history has become fragmented into emergent meta-levels. From a plenum of Being we first conceptualized a difference in modality and then a difference in kind and finally a difference in integrity. Each integral kind of Being has a modality associated with it of being-in-the-world. These modalities have psychological concomitants like pointing, grasping, bearing and encompassing. The various integral kinds of Being define who we are in relation to each other and ourselves. At the level of Pure Being we are subject/object dualisms. But eventually we realize that we are really the ecstasy that projects the nets of duality. And eventually we begin to ask who this ecstatic projector is? When we search we find that enigmatic.

All this talk about us as human beings not in relation to our gendering each other and ourselves. This essay will consider the implications of this for gendering. If we look at ourselves as Smith wishes us to do as kinds of a kind then we will place ourselves at the level of meta-essence. Kinds of a kind are clearly meta-essences. However, instead of this definition of gender I would like to propose that gender actually occurs at each meta-level of Being discovered by contemporary ontology and that the most significant of these is the gendering that occurs in Wild Being because our culture is blind gendering at that level in spite of the fact it exists.

In this paper we will construct a model of archetypal gendering that shows that men and women are complementary to each other by opposing each other through the different kinds

of Being at each archetypal level. Our model will follow but expand on the ideas of Jung by positing at least one deeper level of archetype than the ones he talks about.

celestial female wisdom	terrestrial male wisdom
wise old man	cathonic female
anima	animus
man	woman

If we look at the man and the women in terms of archetypes we see as Jung did that the man has within him a feminine side and the woman has within her a masculine side. But reflected in each of these is again a masculine image within the anima and a feminine image within the animus. But we go on to ask about the nature of the wisdom of the Wise Old man and we find it to be celestial and feminine. If we ask about the wisdom of the cathonic female then we find it terrestrial and masculine. So the ultimate wisdom of the male is that the female can be celestial and the ultimate wisdom of the female is the male can be terrestrial. But we go on from there to assessing each archetypal level a kind of Being that epitomizes it.

Appearance - Pure female celestial wisdom	Essence - Process male terrestrial wisdom
Meta-essence - Hyper wise old man	Berserker - Wild cathonic female
Berserker - Wild anima	Meta-essence - Hyper animus
Essence - Process man	Appearance - Pure woman

This table summarizes the major points that we wish to make with respect to archetypal gender ontology. Each level is a higher level of archetype, the levels in men and women are assigned different kinds of Being as their epitome and finally men and women are made complementary in this process.

We will spend the rest of the paper talking about the implications of this complementarity of archetypal ontological assignments in men and women. But also we want to discuss the fact that our culture is blind to the level of Wild Being so that it is normally impossible to see the important role that Wild Being plays in gendering in our culture. Thus it is important for us to realize that this was not the case with all cultures and so it is necessary for us to explore this dimension of ourselves more than we might

otherwise be inclined.

The goal of this paper is to render the Archetypal Gender Ontology comprehensible as possible. We will be engaged in understanding the kinds of Being as they are exemplified in gendering, but also be trying to understand gendering in terms of the kinds of Being and the operation of the Jungian Archetypes. Further work in this direction can be seen in terms of a philosophical mentoring which would bring out other aspects of this approach to our understanding our humanity.²

Blindness to Gender

Our world is more and more based on the earth dominant Western Colonialist culture which springs from Indo-European origins. This worldview brings with it fundamental ontological assumptions that color everything we comprehend about the world. Most fundamental of these are our notions about what is and what is not. Being is the most fundamental concept in the Indo-European worldview. In the author's dissertation The Structure of Theoretical Systems in Relation to Emergence³ the fragmentation of Being as a phenomena was first recognized and the meta-levels of Being identified based on the work of Continental ontologists. This work was extended in a subsequent book called The Fragmentation of Being and the Path Beyond the Void⁴ in which it was discovered that this fragmentation of the concept of Being had its origins in the mists of Indo-European history and that we are just rediscovering it in modern ontology. In fact, in that book it was shown that the phenomena of emergence, radical newness within the Indo-European worldview, is made possible by the fragmentation of Being. This gives new deeper meaning to the well known phrase "the more things change the more they stay the same." What stays the same are the meta-levels of Being and this sameness allows for radical transformations within the Indo-European worldview. This patterning was set up in the prehistory of the Indo-European worldview when the language of Being unique to the Indo-

² See Philosophical Mentoring: A Research Proposal at <http://dialog.net:85/homepage/philcounsel.htm>

³ <http://dialog.net:85/homepage/disab.html>

⁴ <http://dialog.net:85/homepage/fbpathc.htm>

Europeans was forged. Each verb "to-be" in Indo-European languages are composed out of other roots, so that we can see the results of a cultural project of constructing Being laid down as traces in the languages. When we talk about everything in our world even each other as different genders it is tainted by this linguistic socially constructed projection being.

Each kind of Being is harder to think about than the last lower on the hierarchy. We can get a feel for this by using Bateson's hierarchy of Learning⁵. In fact we can take his physical hierarchy and contrast it to that. He uses motion as an example to show that there are only four physical meta-levels of motion but we can substitute change for motion in order to get definitions that take us across the split between physis (physis, change) and logos (learning). In Advanced Process Architecture⁶ tutorial I produce a model of work process that that combines change and learning to define work.

<u>Logos</u>	<u>Ontos</u>	<u>Phusis</u>
	<u>Neuter</u>	
Learning ¹ <i>learning</i>	Being ¹ PURE	Change ¹ <i>change</i>
Learning ² <i>learning to learn</i>	Being ² PROCESS	Change ² <i>changing change</i>
Learning ³ <i>learning to learn to learn</i>	Being ³ HYPER	Change ³ <i>changing changed changes</i>
Learning ⁴ <i>learning to learn to learn to learn</i>	Being ⁴ WILD	Change ⁴ <i>change of changing changed changes</i>

If you try to think the meta-levels of learning or the meta-levels of change you will find that they get harder and harder to think until one reaches that fifth meta-level that seems unthinkable.

⁵ See Steps to the Ecology of the Mind

⁶ See <http://dialog.net:85/homepage/advanced.htm>

Archetypal Gender Ontology -- KENT PALMER

Each level of learning or change indicates a level of Being which is the synthetic unity of Physus and Logos at that meta-level. If we define work as beginning with what Sartre calls the practico-inert and applying differentially change and learning to it then the meta-levels of change and learning together define work processes. The point here is that as we go up the meta-levels we are assuming that it is irrelevant what gender one happens to be. But our archetypal model tells us otherwise. In fact there are fundamental differences between men and women as they go up the meta-levels with respect to their prosecution of their lives. Thus the hypothesis here is that men and women although they share the kinds of Being actually are complementary in their implementation of them concretely and practically in their lives. Thus learning and change at the various meta-levels takes on a different character for the man and the woman.

<u>Logos</u>	<u>Ontos</u> <u>Male</u>	<u>Ontos</u> <u>Female</u>	<u>Phusus</u>
Learning ₁ <i>Learning</i>	Being ² PROCESS	Being ¹ PURE	Change ¹ <i>change</i>
Learning ₂ <i>learning to learn</i>	Being ⁴ WILD	Being ³ HYPHER	Change ² <i>changing change</i>
Learning ₃ <i>learning to learn to learn</i>	Being ³ HYPHER	Being ⁴ WILD	Change ³ <i>changing changed changes</i>
Learning ₄ <i>learning to learn to learn to learn</i>	Being ¹ APPEARANCE	Being ² ESSENCE	Change ⁴ <i>change of changing changed changes</i>

The scrambling of the ontos with respect to the physus and logos has profound implications for us as human beings trapped in the Indo-European worldview. It colors our view of each other in fundamental ways. In other words, we

appear outwardly to have the same understanding of physus and logos meta-levels but in terms of our inward archetypal understanding the kinds of Being are scrambled in relation to the meta-levels of learning and change so as to make men and women complementary within our worldview. This scrambling effect is what accounts for the continual misunderstanding between men and women. If we did not share the kinds of Being with each other we could not be in the same Indo-European worldview but if we did not apply them differently then we would be the same. So in order to erect the gender differences there are profound cultural routines that are socially constructed that produce the difference between men and women by applying the various meta-levels of being differently at the various meta-levels of learning and change.

A great deal of human suffering has been occasioned by the mutual mis-understandings that this ontological repatterning that produces gender has occasioned. Thus we cannot talk about it without incurring some pain. But we will hope that knowledge of what is happening on this fundamental level will in some way entail a healing process that needs to occur as we recognize how our culture transmits a gender based fundamental ontology to each of us to produce complementarity across the all important gender demarcation line. Without each gender knowing all four levels of Being we could not live in the same worldview, but without variety in assignment of roles with respect to those meta-levels of Being then we would not perceive gender differences in the world and thus the world would not be nearly as interesting to us. However, the same thing that generates our interest in the complementary other is what creates all the misunderstanding between the sexes.

We must remark that ontological gender differences are inward expressions of ontological assignment and are thus archetypal rather than outward. Outwardly the Neuter ontological assignment prevails. But inwardly the ontological gender assignments vary depending on sex. Thus there is a powerful commonality outwardly. But inwardly there is a fundamental difference that corresponds to the outward physical difference between the sexes that is used as a marker for gender enculturation that produces the inward archetypal differentiations.